




the review, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Here, Plaintiff’s objections do not identify any factual or legal errors on the part of Judge Holmes in making her determinations. Objections which do not identify an error are meritless. *See Howard v. Sec. of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s objections fail to state viable grounds to challenge Judge Holmes’ conclusions or otherwise provide a basis to reject or modify the Report and Recommendation.

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and considered Plaintiff’s objections, the Court concludes that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 72) should be adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant Carter is **DISMISSED** under Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for lack of service of process; Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 60) is **DENIED**; and Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 47) is **GRANTED** and this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice as to all claims.

It is so **ORDERED**.

  
WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE